

Taft College Academic Senate Minutes

Monday September 11, 2023

Cougar Room

12:10 pm - 1:00 pm

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by President Duron at 12:10pm.

Attendees

Based on the sign-in sheets and participation, the following faculty members attended: Abbott, A., Altenhofel, J., Beasley, M., Cahoon, M., Cahoon, N., Chung-Wee, C., Clark, A., Devine, W (B.), Duron, C., Dyer, G., Eveland, S., Getty, S., Jimenez Murguia, S., Kerr, D., Lytle, S., Martinez, M., Mendenhall, J., Mitchell, D., Nishiyama, W., Oja, M., Page, J., Payne, B., Payne, R., Polski, R., Reynolds, J., Rodenhauser, D., Taylor, C.

Additionally, the following administrators signed in: Lopez, J., and Minor, L.

Public Comment

There was no comment by a member of the public, but V. Jacobi did thank everyone for the well wishes after her accident.

Action Items

Approval of the Minutes

August 18, 2023

C. Duron motioned to postpone this agenda item as there was a request to add additional details. M. Beasley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

New Business

- ZTC Acceleration Grant
 - Dean J. Lopez introduced this grant as a continuation of the Planning grant that we are currently utilizing. In addition to the Administration of Justice transfer degree, we have several transfer degrees (ADTs) whose required courses are close to being completely zero-textbook cost (ZTC) (such as History, Psychology, and Sociology) but we might need to work to get GE (General Education) pathways ZTC, though. Studio Arts is also interested in a ZTC ADT. However, this Acceleration grant requires that we don't duplicate degree pathways that other colleges already have. Ideas for new ADT's are Business/Management.
 - The proposal is due this Friday (Sept. 15), but we'd like to request an extension to Nov. 15.
 - There was a motion by M. Oja, and a second by G. Dyer. The motion passed to submit the application for this grant. M. Martinez abstained.
- Apprenticeship Grant

DRAFT

- C. Duron introduced this grant by stating that the timeframe of the deadline forced us to skip the process of going to the AS Council.
- J. Lopez said that we were invited by the CCCCO to participate so that students could earn college credit for apprenticeships.
- The grant is for \$200k. We'd get half if we state our intent to complete the following:
 - Review curriculum, which may lead to creating curriculum
 - Have a Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) process
 - Have an apprenticeship pathway cohort
- A. Abbott confirmed that we are agreeing to an *intent* to do the three tasks.
- We could get the second half of the grant when we document that these three tasks are completed. There is no deadline for this second phase.
- There were many questions about the grant and our local needs. The answers tended to be that we're waiting for more details about the grant, and that we'd use the grant money to help explore local needs. Other answers note that we can leverage our existing relationship with WestTec, and that we currently do not have apprenticeship curriculum. Regionally, there are apprenticeships in electrical, carbon capture, and construction.
- V. Jacobi noted that an internship is different from an apprenticeship. An apprenticeship must be paid and usually involves a union from that industry.
- V. Jacobi mentioned that this is a big task on top of a lot of other curriculum work that will be coming from the state soon. L. Minor suggested that the state is pushing new workforce programs (new Chancellor).
- R. Payne noted that the first half (\$100k) wouldn't be enough to purchase equipment. L. Minor said that we could also use CTE (Career Technical Education) funds.
- B. Devine motioned and J. Chaidez seconded. Motion passed. J. Altenhofel and V. Jacobi voted nay, and J. Reynolds abstained.
- Ad Hoc Committee: review and recommend changes to AP 7120 Recruitment and Hiring Procedure and AP 7211 Faculty Service Areas Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies
 - C. Duron shared that the AS Council suggested creation of an ad hoc committee to review AP 7120 and AP 7211, and that we strive to have one faculty representative from each division. The purpose of the ad hoc committee will be to review the AP's and make recommendations.
 - Motion was made by R. Polski, seconded by V. Jacobi and passed.
 - C. Duron asked Division Chairs to make suggestions for committee members to create a committee of 6-10 faculty.

Discussion/Action Item

Resolution to add generative AI as an example to Academic Honesty policy

- B. Devine introduced his resolution, talking about his worry that a robot voice may replace student voices.
- V. Jacobi asked about the phrase "Academic Honesty policy" in the Resolved because there are no similar examples in the Board Policies (BPs) or Administrative Procedures (APs). It appears that B. Devine meant the "Academic Dishonesty examples in the Student Handbook." However, this was never changed in the resolution.
- A. Abbott asked if this resolution would include all AI (Artificial Intelligence) since some AI can be beneficial.

DRAFT

- B. Devine answered that we should teach students how to use AI.
- A. Abbott further questioned whether a product like Grammarly would be considered AI.
- B. Devine said that he did not intend for something like Grammarly to be included. Only products that the AI created from scratch.
- Further noting confusion in definitions, S. Eveland noted that there can be text-generating software, artificial intelligence, and text-generating AI.
- V. Jacobi asked about art generated by AI, which wouldn't be included in the current Resolved. She also shared that other colleges provide example statements for your syllabus that range from very lax to very stringent since different disciplines have different needs. V. Jacobi suggested that this kind of statement should be in the syllabus, not in the Student Handbook.
- M. Oja offered two comments. First, some students might see this as telling them that they can never use any AI software. Second, this resolution seems to be an overreach, affecting the academic freedom of a faculty member to utilize AI and text-generative software how they see fit in their courses.
- S. Getty shared that she likes the resolution, but that it does not really include math topics. She wants the resolution to be more generic, and maybe add a caveat about following each instructor's directions.
 - B. Devine considers math to be "information" so he thinks that math would be included in the proposed resolution.
- C. Taylor clarifies that this resolution may provide a connection between our individual syllabi and the Student Handbook.
- C. Chung Wee clarified that this is not saying that instructors can't have students use AI, but that students can't misrepresent work by AI as their own. This issue is slightly different from plagiarism. He also suggested that our Academic Dishonesty examples should include AI; AI isn't going anywhere.
- J. Altenhofel offered a historical perspective that AI is just a new way to plagiarize, so the plagiarism example should be enough.
- J. Reynolds argues that the "another" in the plagiarism example makes it sound like a person, which AI is not.
- R. Payne likes the misrepresentation example. She suggests that we expand it to include instructor statements and explain how misrepresentation is different from plagiarism.
- C. Chung Wee argued that plagiarism doesn't include text generated by AI.
- B. Devine summarized his position, and proposed a revised example in the Resolved:
 - Misrepresentation: presenting content created by artificial intelligence (AI) generative software as your own works and ideas.
 - J. Reynolds motioned to approve this revised resolution. R. Polski seconded. The motion passed, with four nay's (G. Dyer, S. Jimenez Murguia, T. Mendoza, M. Oja) and one abstention (M. Beasley).
 - There was a request to clear up the font and spacing.

Informational Items

Committee Reports

Student Learning Outcomes Annual Report

- SLO Coordinator S. Eveland stated that this report should be shared with Academic Senate each year.

DRAFT

- She thanked the former SLO Coordinator, T. Mendoza, for her amazing work, and S. Eveland is following T. Mendoza's plans and ideas.
- S. Eveland also thanked us all for our work mapping our SLOs during in-service.
- S. Eveland shared parts of a report from eLumen. She knows that the report has glitches in that all of the course SLOs are not connected in eLumen. She's asking Division Chairs to track down the glitches.
- Of the data in the report, we are doing well in SLO achievement of course SLOs, Institutional SLOs, and GE SLOs.
- What S. Eveland would still like to do is:
 - Have the SLOASC group to identify a process to get course SLOs to the Curriculum and GE Committee now that course SLOs should be on the CORs (Course Outline of Records).
 - Have SLOASC review and update the SLO Guidebook.
 - Draft non-instructional learning outcomes with definitions and templates

ASCCC

C. Duron shared the following upcoming meetings. Contact her if you are interested in attending.

- Area A Meeting: October 27, 2023
- Fall Plenary November 16 - 18, 2023

Other

There were no other comments.

Adjournment

C. Duron adjourned the meeting at 1pm as all business was accomplished.